



Our Docket No.: 42390P11155

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

In re Application of:)	
)	
Richard J. Qian)	Examiner: Rones, Charles
)	
Application No.: 09/870,867)	Art Group: 2164
)	
Filed: May 30, 2001)	
)	
For: Integrating Content From Media)	
Sources)	

Mail Stop: Appeal Brief - Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

APPEAL BRIEF
IN SUPPORT OF APPELLANT'S APPEAL
TO THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Sir:

Applicant (hereinafter "Appellant") hereby submits this Appeal Brief (hereinafter "Brief") in support of its appeal from a final decision by the Examiner, mailed February 14, 2005, in the above-referenced Application. Appellant respectfully requests consideration of this appeal by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences (hereinafter "Board") for allowance of the above-captioned patent application.

An oral hearing is not desired.




TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	REAL PARTY IN INTEREST	3
II.	RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES	3
III.	STATUS OF THE CLAIMS	3
IV.	STATUS OF AMENDMENTS	4
V.	SUMMARY OF THE CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER	5
VI.	GROUND OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL	7
VII.	ARGUMENT	8
VIII.	CONCLUSION	16
IX.	APPENDIX OF CLAIMS	i

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The invention is assigned to Intel Corporation of 2200 Mission College Boulevard, Santa Clara, California 95052.

II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

To the best of Appellant's knowledge, there are no appeals or interferences related to the present appeal that will directly affect, be directly affected by, or have a bearing on the Board's decision.

III. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 1-2, 4-12, 14-22 and 24-30 are currently pending in the above-referenced application. No claims have been allowed.

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

Claims 1-2, 4-12, 14-22 and 24-30 are currently pending in the subject application. These claims were finally rejected in the final Office Action mailed February 14, 2005. The Examiner confirmed the final rejection of these claims in an Advisory Action mailed April 20, 2005 (hereinafter "Advisory Action").

In response to the final Office Action mailed February 14, 2005, rejecting claims 1-2, 4-12, 14-22 and 24-30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), Appellant filed a Response After Final pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 on March 21, 2005. No amendments were presented. Subsequently, the Advisory Action was mailed on April 20, 2005 maintaining all rejections in the Final Office Action. In response, Appellant filed a Notice of Appeal on May 13, 2005. A copy of all claims on appeal is attached hereto as an Appendix of Claims.

Appellant respectfully traverses each of the grounds of rejection.

V. SUMMARY OF THE CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

According to one embodiment, a method is described. The method comprises media sources being searched for content and metadata based on search criteria, and then parsing the metadata in real-time. Subsequently, user preference information is received from a content service provider. Then, the content and the metadata are integrated according to the user's preferences and the parsed metadata. After which the integrated content and metadata is sent to the content service provider and then rendered concurrently on multiple displays. (see Specification page 11, lines 2-12).

In a further embodiment, an apparatus is described. The apparatus includes a memory to store executable instructions and a processor. The processor is coupled with the memory and the processor is to execute the following instructions. (see Specification page 2, lines 10-15). The instructions are to search a plurality of media sources for content and metadata based on a search criteria, parse, in real-time, the metadata received from the plurality of media sources, receive user preference information from a user, integrate the content and the metadata corresponding to a search criteria in accordance with the user preference information and based on the parsing of the metadata, and display the integrated content concurrently using one or more displays. (see Specification page 11, lines 2-12).

In another embodiment, a machine-readable medium is described. The machine-readable medium comprises sets of instructions to perform the following functions. (see Specification page 2, lines 10-15). The functions are to search a plurality of media sources for content and metadata based on a search criteria, parse, in real-time, the metadata received from the plurality of media sources, receive user preference information from a user, integrate the content and the metadata corresponding to a search

criteria in accordance with the user preference information and based on the parsing of the metadata, and display the integrated content concurrently on one or more displays.

(see Specification page 11, lines 2-12).

VI. GROUND OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

Claims 1-2, 4-12, 14-22 and 24-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sezan, et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,236,395 (hereinafter "Sezan") in view of Kelts, U.S. Patent Application No. 2001/0030667 (hereinafter "Kelts").

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 7-12, 14-15, 21-22, 24-25 and 27-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sull et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0069218 (hereinafter "Sull") in view of Kelts.

VII. ARGUMENT

A. THE PENDING CLAIMS WERE IMPROPERLY REJECTED UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(A) BECAUSE SEZAN AND KELTS NEITHER INDIVIDUALLY NOR WHEN COMBINED IN ANY COMBINATION TEACH OR REASONABLY SUGGEST RECEIVING USER PREFERENCE INFORMATION FROM A CONTENT SERVICE PROVIDER AND SENDING THE INTEGRATED CONTENT AND METADATA TO THE CONTENT SERVICE PROVIDER

Claims 1-2, 4-12, 14-22 and 24-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sezan in view of Kelts as stated in the final Office Action mailed February 14, 2005. Appellant respectfully submits that Sezan and Kelts neither individually nor when combined in any combination teach or reasonably suggest the claimed invention for at least the reasons set forth below.

Claim 1 recites:

A method for integrating content, comprising:
searching a plurality of media sources for content and metadata based on a search criteria;
parsing the metadata received from the plurality of media sources, wherein the parsing is performed in real-time;
receiving user preference information from a content service provider;
integrating the content and the metadata corresponding to a search criteria in accordance with the user preference information and based on the parsing of the metadata;
sending the integrated content and metadata to the content service provider; and
rendering the integrated content concurrently using one or more displays.
(emphasis provided)

Claim 11 recites:

An apparatus for delivering content, comprising:
a memory to store executable instructions; and
a processor, coupled with the memory, the processor to execute the instructions to:

search a plurality of media sources for content and metadata based on a search criteria;
parse the metadata received from the plurality of media sources, wherein the parsing of the metadata is performed in real-time;
receive user preference information from a user;
integrate the content and the metadata corresponding to a search criteria in accordance with the user preference information and based on the parsing of the metadata; and
display the integrated content concurrently using one or more displays.
(emphasis provided)

Appellant's claim 21 recites:

A machine-readable medium having stored thereon data representing sets of instructions which when executed by a machine, cause the machine to:
search a plurality of media sources for content and metadata based on a search criteria;
parse the metadata received from the plurality of media sources, wherein the parsing of the metadata is performed in real-time;
receive user preference information from a user;
integrate the content and the metadata corresponding to a search criteria in accordance with the user preference information and based on the parsing of the metadata; and
display the integrated content concurrently on one or more displays.
(emphasis provided)

Sezan discloses "a system for managing audiovisual information, and in particular a system for audiovisual information browsing, filtering, searching, archiving, and personalization." (paragraph 0001, lines 1-4; emphasis provided). Sezan does not teach or reasonably suggest "receiving user preference information from a content service provider . . . [and] sending the integrated content and metadata to the content service provider" as recited by claim 1. (emphasis provided). The Examiner acknowledges that Sezan "discloses the claimed invention *except for* the receiving user preference

[information] from a content service provider and sending the integrated content and metadata to the content service provider.” (final Office Action, mailed February 14, 2005, at page 3, paragraph 3; emphasis provided). Instead, the Examiner relies on Kelts.

Kelts discloses “individual application databases preferably contain[ing] broadcast and programming information . . . [and] data stored in the various application databases . . . [and] user information, which may include names, email addresses, account information (credit available, subscription packages, etc.), and preferences.” (paragraph 0107). Kelts further discloses that “. . . *the individual content providers and service providers will be responsible for updating and maintaining the data stored in [the] application databases.*” (paragraph 0107; emphasis provided).

Kelts does not teach or reasonably suggest “receiving user preference information from a content service provider . . . [and] sending the integrated content and metadata to the content service provider” as recited by claim 1. (emphasis provided). Having individual content providers and service providers for updating and maintaining the data stored in application databases (Kelts, paragraph 0107) is not the same as “receiving of user preference information from a content service provider . . . [and] sending of the integrated content and metadata to the content service provider.” (claim 1; emphasis provided). Stated differently, the individual content service providers in Kelts do not receive non-integrated user preference information, process it into integrated content and then send it back to the user. (see claim 1). *The individual service providers simply maintain databases that contain non-integrated user data.* Kelts does not teach or reasonably suggest “receiving of user preference information from a content service provider . . . [and] sending of the integrated content and metadata to the content service provider” as recited by claim 1. (emphasis provided). Sezan and Kelts, neither

individually nor when combined, teach or reasonably suggest all the limitations of claim

1. Accordingly, Appellant respectfully submits that claim 1 and its dependant claims are patentable over Sezan in view of Kelts.

Claims 11 and 21 contain limitations similar to those of claim 1. Accordingly, claims 11 and 21 and their dependant claims are also patentable over Sezan in view of Kelts.

B. THE PENDING CLAIMS WERE IMPROPERLY REJECTED UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) BECAUSE SULL AND KELTS NEITHER INDIVIDUALLY NOR WHEN COMBINED IN ANY COMBINATION TEACH OR REASONABLY SUGGEST RECEIVING USER PREFERENCE INFORMATION FROM A CONTENT SERVICE PROVIDER AND SENDING THE INTEGRATED CONTENT AND METADATA TO THE CONTENT SERVICE PROVIDER

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 7-12, 14-15, 21-22, 24-25 and 27-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sull in view of Kelts as stated in the final Office Action mailed February 14, 2005. Appellant respectfully submits that Sull and Kelts neither individually nor when combined in any combination teach or reasonably suggest the claimed invention for at least the reasons set forth below.

Claim 1 recites:

A method for integrating content, comprising:
searching a plurality of media sources for content and metadata based on a search criteria;
parsing the metadata received from the plurality of media sources, wherein the parsing is performed in real-time;
receiving user preference information from a content service provider;
integrating the content and the metadata corresponding to a search criteria in accordance with the user preference information and based on the parsing of the metadata;
sending the integrated content and metadata to the content service provider; and
rendering the integrated content concurrently using one or more displays.
(emphasis provided)

Claim 11 recites:

An apparatus for delivering content, comprising:
a memory to store executable instructions; and
a processor, coupled with the memory, the processor to execute the instructions to:
search a plurality of media sources for content and metadata based on a search criteria;

parse the metadata received from the plurality of media sources, wherein the parsing of the metadata is performed in real-time;
receive user preference information from a user;
integrate the content and the metadata corresponding to a search criteria in accordance with the user preference information and based on the parsing of the metadata; and
display the integrated content concurrently using one or more displays.
(emphasis provided)

Appellant's claim 21 recites:

A machine-readable medium having stored thereon data representing sets of instructions which when executed by a machine, cause the machine to:
search a plurality of media sources for content and metadata based on a search criteria;
parse the metadata received from the plurality of media sources, wherein the parsing of the metadata is performed in real-time;
receive user preference information from a user;
integrate the content and the metadata corresponding to a search criteria in accordance with the user preference information and based on the parsing of the metadata; and
display the integrated content concurrently on one or more displays.
(emphasis provided)

Sull discloses a system "... for tagging, indexing, searching, retrieving, manipulating, and editing video images on a wide area network such as the Internet."
(Abstract, lines 1-3). Sull does not teach or reasonably suggest "receiving user preference information from a content service provider . . . [and] sending the integrated content and metadata to the content service provider" as recited by claim 1. (emphasis provided). The Examiner acknowledges that Sull "discloses the claimed invention *except for* the receiving user preference [information] from a content service provider and sending the integrated content and metadata to the content service provider." (final

Office Action, mailed February 14, 2005, at page 6, paragraph 6; emphasis provided). Instead, the Examiner relies on Kelts.

As previously discussed with regard to issue A (pages 7-10), Kelts discloses “individual application databases preferably contain[ing] broadcast and programming information . . . [and] data stored in the various application databases . . . {and} user information, which may include names, email addresses, account information (credit available, subscription packages, etc.), and preferences.” (paragraph 0107). Kelts further discloses that “. . . *the individual content providers and service providers will be responsible for updating and maintaining the data stored in [the] application databases.*” (paragraph 0107; emphasis provided).

Kelts does not teach or reasonably suggest “receiving user preference information from a content service provider . . . [and] sending the integrated content and metadata to the content service provider” as recited by claim 1. (emphasis provided). Having individual content providers and service providers for updating and maintaining the data stored in application databases (Kelts, paragraph 0107) is not the same as “receiving of user preference information from a content service provider . . . [and] sending of the integrated content and metadata to the content service provider.” (claim 1; emphasis provided). Stated differently, the individual content service providers in Kelts do not receive non-integrated user preference information, process it into integrated content and then send it back to the user. (see claim 1). *The individual service providers simply maintain databases that contain non-integrated user data.* Kelts does not teach or reasonably suggest “receiving of user preference information from a content service provider . . . [and] sending of the integrated content and metadata to the content service provider” as recited by claim 1. (emphasis provided). Sull and Kelts, neither

individually nor when combined, teach or reasonably suggest all the limitations of claim

1. Accordingly, Appellant respectfully submits that claim 1 and its dependant claims are patentable over Sull in view of Kelts.

Claims 11 and 21 contain limitations similar to those of claim 1. Accordingly, claims 11 and 21 and their dependant claims are also patentable over Sull in view of Kelts.

VIII. CONCLUSION


Appellant respectfully submits that all appealed claims in this application are patentable and were improperly rejected by the Examiner during prosecution before the United States Patent and Trademark Office. Appellant respectfully requests that the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences overrule the Examiner and direct allowance of the rejected claims.

This Brief is submitted with a check for \$500.00 to cover the appeal fee for one other than a small entity as specified in 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(c). Please charge any shortages and credit any overpayments to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: October 5, 2005



Brent E. Vecchia
Reg. No. 48,011

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA. 90025-1030
(303) 740-1980



IX. APPENDIX OF CLAIMS (37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(viii))

The claims on appeal read as follows:

1. A method for integrating content, comprising:

searching a plurality of media sources for content and metadata based on a search

criteria;

parsing the metadata received from the plurality of media sources, wherein the

parsing is performed in real-time;

receiving user preference information from a content service provider;

integrating the content and the metadata corresponding to a search criteria in

accordance with the user preference information and based on the parsing

of the metadata;

sending the integrated content and metadata to the content service provider; and

rendering the integrated content concurrently using one or more displays.
2. The method of claim 1, further comprising providing the integrated content and
the metadata to a presenter.
4. The method of claim 1, wherein the plurality of media sources comprise
television programs, Internet broadcasts, and web pages.
5. The method of claim 1, further comprising passing the metadata resulting from
the parsing and an associated content to an information integrator using an
extensible markup language (XML).
6. The method of claim 1, further comprising passing the metadata resulting from
the parsing and an associated content to an information integrator via an
Application Programming Interface (API).

7. The method of claim 1, wherein the content is associated with one or more metadata descriptions.
8. The method of claim 7, wherein the one or more metadata descriptions are created by a multi-modal analysis engine.
9. The method of claim 8, wherein the multi-modal analysis engine comprises one or more of the following: a video analyzer, an audio analyzer, and a digital analyzer.
10. The method of claim 1, further comprising storing the integrated content for access by the user.
11. An apparatus for delivering content, comprising:
 - a memory to store executable instructions; and
 - a processor, coupled with the memory, the processor to execute the instructions to:
 - search a plurality of media sources for content and metadata based on a search criteria;
 - parse the metadata received from the plurality of media sources, wherein the parsing of the metadata is performed in real-time;
 - receive user preference information from a user;
 - integrate the content and the metadata corresponding to a search criteria in accordance with the user preference information and based on the parsing of the metadata; and
 - display the integrated content concurrently using one or more displays.
12. The apparatus of claim 11, wherein the processor is further to provide the integrated content to an information presenter.

14. The apparatus of claim 11, wherein the plurality of media sources comprises television programs, Internet broadcasts, and web pages.
15. The apparatus of claim 11, further comprising a data description manager to pass the metadata resulting from the parsing and an associated content to an information integrator using an extensible markup language (XML).
16. The apparatus of claim 15, wherein the data description manager is further to pass the metadata resulting from the parsing and an associated content to an information integrator via an Application Programming Interface (API).
17. The apparatus of claim 11, wherein the content is associated with one or more metadata descriptions.
18. The apparatus of claim 17, wherein the one or more metadata descriptions are created by a multi-modal analysis engine.
19. The apparatus of claim 18, wherein the multi-modal analysis engine comprises one or more of the following: a video analyzer, an audio analyzer, and a digital analyzer.
20. The apparatus of claim 11, wherein the processor is further to store the integrated content for access by the user.
21. A machine-readable medium having stored thereon data representing sets of instructions which when executed by a machine, cause the machine to:
 - search a plurality of media sources for content and metadata based on a search criteria;
 - parse the metadata received from the plurality of media sources, wherein the parsing of the metadata is performed in real-time;
 - receive user preference information from a user;

- integrate the content and the metadata corresponding to a search criteria in accordance with the user preference information and based on the parsing of the metadata; and
- display the integrated content concurrently on one or more displays.
22. The machine-readable medium of claim 21, wherein the sets of instructions which, when executed by the machine, further cause the machine to provide the integrated content to an information presenter.
24. The machine-readable medium of claim 21, wherein the plurality of media sources comprises one or more of the following: television programs, Internet broadcasts, and web pages.
25. The machine-readable medium of claim 21, wherein the sets of instructions which, when executed by the machine, further cause the machine to pass the metadata resulting from the parsing and an associated content to an information integrator using an extensible markup language (XML).
26. The machine-readable medium of claim 21, wherein the sets of instructions which, when executed by the machine, further cause the machine to pass the metadata resulting from the parsing and an associated content to an information integrator via an Application Programming Interface (API).
27. The machine-readable medium of claim 21, wherein the content is associated with one or more metadata descriptions.
28. The machine-readable medium of claim 27, wherein the sets of instructions which, when executed by the machine, further cause the machine to create the one or more metadata descriptions using a multi-modal analysis engine.

29. The machine-readable medium of claim 28, wherein the multi-modal analysis engine comprises one or more of the following: a video analyzer, an audio analyzer, and a digital analyzer.
30. The machine-readable medium of claim 21, wherein the sets of instructions which, when executed by the machine, further cause the machine to store the integrated content for access by the user.



CERTIFICATE OF MAILING/TRANSMISSION (37 CFR 1.8A)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is, on the date shown below, being:

MAILING

☒ deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

FACSIMILE


☐ transmitted by facsimile to at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office.

Date: October 5, 2005

Debbie Casias
Debbie Casias

10/5/05

Date



Docket No: 42390P11155

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:)	
)	
Richard J. Qian)	Examiner: Rones, Charles
)	
Application No: 09/870,867)	Art Unit: 2175
)	
Filed: May 30, 2001)	
)	
For: Integrating Content From Media)	
<u>Sources</u>)	

RESPONSE TO NOTICE OF NON-COMPLIANT APPEAL BRIEF

Mail Stop Appeal -Brief Patents
Commissioner of Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313

Sir:

In response to the Notice of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief mailed on September 23, 2005, please find the amended Appeal Brief enclosed herewith and consider the following remarks.

FIRST CLASS CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that I am causing the above-referenced correspondence to be deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage on the date indicated below and that this paper or fee has been addressed to the Mail Stop Appeal -Brief Patents, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Date of Deposit: October 5, 2005

Name of Person Mailing Correspondence: Debbie Casias

Debbie Casias
Signature

10/05/05
Date

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to review the following remarks with regard to the amendments made to the following sections of the Appeal Brief.

Summary of the Claims

The Examiner asserts that the “Summary of the Claims is missing a concise explanation of the invention defined in ALL the claims involved in the appeal.” (see Notification of Non-compliance at page 2, lines 1-2). However, 37 C.F.R. 41.37(c)(1)(v) states that “a concise explanation of the subject matter defined *in each of the independent claims involved in the appeal*” is required. (see 37 C.F.R. 41.37(c)(1)(v); emphasis provided). Therefore, Applicant has amended the Summary of the Claims to include a concise explanation of the subject matter defined in independent claims 1, 11 and 21. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the objection.

Status of the Claims

The Examiner has objected to the Status of the Claims section for including citations of authorities, statutes, and parts of the record relied on. The Status of the Claims section has been amended to not include the citations of authorities, statutes, and parts of the record relied on. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the objection.

Status of the Amendments

The Examiner has objected to the Status of the Amendments section for failing to state the status of the amendments. The Status of the Amendments section has been

amended to state the status of the amendments. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the objection.

Invitation for a Telephone Interview

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

Request for an Extension of Time

Applicants respectfully petition for an extension of time to respond to the outstanding Office Action pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) should one be necessary. Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 to cover the necessary fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a) for such an extension.


Charge our Deposit Account

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: October 5, 2005



Aslam A. Jaffery
Reg. No. 51,841

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
7th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1030
(303) 740-1980

**Notification of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief
(37 CFR 41.37)**

Application No.

09/870,867

Applicant(s)

QIAN, RICHARD J.

Examiner

Neveen Abel-Jalil

Art Unit

2165


--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

The Appeal Brief filed on 18 July 2005 is defective for failure to comply with one or more provisions of 37 CFR 41.37.

To avoid dismissal of the appeal, applicant must file an amended brief or other appropriate correction (see MPEP 1205.03) within **ONE MONTH or THIRTY DAYS** from the mailing date of this Notification, whichever is longer.
EXTENSIONS OF THIS TIME PERIOD MAY BE GRANTED UNDER 37 CFR 1.136.

1. ☒ The brief does not contain the items required under 37 CFR 41.37(c), or the items are not under the proper heading or in the proper order.
2. ☐ The brief does not contain a statement of the status of all claims, (e.g., rejected, allowed, withdrawn, objected to, canceled), or does not identify the appealed claims (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(iii)).
3. ☐ At least one amendment has been filed subsequent to the final rejection, and the brief does not contain a statement of the status of each such amendment (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(iv)).
4. ☒ (a) The brief does not contain a concise explanation of the subject matter defined in each of the independent claims involved in the appeal, referring to the specification by page and line number and to the drawings, if any, by reference characters; and/or (b) the brief fails to: (1) identify, for each independent claim involved in the appeal and for each dependent claim argued separately, every means plus function and step plus function under 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph, and/or (2) set forth the structure, material, or acts described in the specification as corresponding to each claimed function with reference to the specification by page and line number, and to the drawings, if any, by reference characters (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(v)).
5. ☐ The brief does not contain a concise statement of each ground of rejection presented for review (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(vi)).
6. ☐ The brief does not present an argument under a separate heading for each ground of rejection on appeal (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(vii)).
7. ☐ The brief does not contain a correct copy of the appealed claims as an appendix thereto (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(viii)).
8. ☐ The brief does not contain copies of the evidence submitted under 37 CFR 1.130, 1.131, or 1.132 or of any other evidence entered by the examiner and relied upon by appellant in the appeal, along with a statement setting forth where in the record that evidence was entered by the examiner, as an appendix thereto (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(ix)).
9. ☐ The brief does not contain copies of the decisions rendered by a court or the Board in the proceeding identified in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of the brief as an appendix thereto (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(x)).
10. ☒ Other (including any explanation in support of the above items):

See Continuation Sheet.


CHARLES RONES
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Neveen Abel-Jalil
AU 2165

Continuation of 10. Other (including any explanation in support of the above items): It appears that the Summary of the claims is missing a concise explanation of the invention defined in ALL the claims involved in the appeal. This explanation is required to refer to the specification by page and line number, and, if there is a drawing, to the drawing by reference characters. Detailed descriptions for claims 1-2, 4-14, 14-22, and 24-30 with reference numbers, support in the specification, or drawings appear to be missing.

Under the heading "Status of the Claims", there is no need to state the citations of authorities, statutes, and parts of the record relied on.

Under the heading "Status of Amendments", Appellant failed to state the status of Amendments instead the status of rejected claims is cited.



AT-2175 zfw

TRANSMITTAL FORM <i>(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)</i>	Application No.	09/870,867	
	Filing Date	May 30, 2001	
	First Named Inventor	Richard J. Qian	
	Art Unit	2175	
	Examiner Name	C. Rones	
Total Number of Pages in This Submission	23	Attorney Docket Number	42390P11155

ENCLOSURES (check all that apply)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form <input type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached <input type="checkbox"/> Amendment / Response <input type="checkbox"/> After Final <input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request <input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement <input type="checkbox"/> PTO/SB/08 <input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts/Incomplete Application <input type="checkbox"/> Basic Filing Fee <input type="checkbox"/> Declaration/POA <input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53	<input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers <input type="checkbox"/> Petition <input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert a Provisional Application <input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address <input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer <input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund <input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance Communication to Group <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Group (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) <input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information <input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: Enclosure(s) (please identify below): <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin-top: 10px;">RESPONSE TO NOTICE OF NON-COMPLIANT APPEAL BRIEF</div>
Remarks		

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT	
Firm or Individual name	Aslam A. Jaffery, Reg. No. 51,841 BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
Signature	
Date	October 5, 2005

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING/TRANSMISSION			
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.			
Typed or printed name	Debbie Casias		
Signature		Date	October 5, 2005